

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 remain in the case.

Reconsideration of this Application and entry of the foregoing amendments are requested. Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended in view of the Office Action and to better define what the Applicants consider their invention, as fully supported by an enabling disclosure. No new matter has been entered.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4 and 5 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

Applicants amend claims 1, 4 and 5 to recite the fluid, as suggested by the Examiner.

In view of the above and foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw her rejection of claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 as being unpatentable over US patent no. 5,983,778 to **Dawson** in view of US patent no. 3,508,773 to **Coberly**, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, first paragraph.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

Coberly teaches that it is known in the art to form an external coupling between two members, so as to prevent movements of these members (see column 3, lines 1-3; column 4, lines 1-6), made in nitrided steel (see column 9, lines 5-10).

One skilled in the art, by combining the teaching of **Coberly** to that of **Dawson** could not be led to the telescopic hoist as recited in the claims, since none of them teaches or even hints at such a telescopic hoist. Moreover, using the teachings of

Coberly would go against the objective of **Dawson** of repeated telescopic movements of tubular members.

Moreover, although the properties of nitrided steel may be known, neither of the cited references hints at the combination of these properties with the formation of a fluid film on the surfaces, as recited in the present claims.

In view of the above and foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw her rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, first paragraph.

The rejections of the claims are believed to have been overcome by the present remarks and amendments. From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such an action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MAINVILLE, Luc

by: /Nicholas A. Kees/
Nicholas A. Kees
Reg. No. 29,552

GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Tel.: 414-273-3500
Fax: 414-273-5198
E-mail: nakees@gklaw.com